United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address:	COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS	
	P.O. Box 1450	
	Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450	
	www.uspto.gov	

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/519,136	03/06/2000	Jim B. Estipona	042390.P8359	7704
7.	590 05/21/2004	EXAM	INER	
Charles A Mi		TRAN, MYLINH T		
Blakely Sokolo 12400 Wilshire	off Taylor & Zafman LLP Boulevard	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
7th Floor		2174	1a	
Los Angeles, (CA 90025		DATE MAILED: 05/21/2004	1-1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

• 強		
•	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/519,136	ESTIPONA, JIM B.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mylinh T Tran	2174
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reg. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailine earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply ply within the statutory minimum of thirty (3 d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS te, cause the application to become ABAN	v be timely filed 10) days will be considered timely. 5 from the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133)
Status		
 1) ⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Ame 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ Thi 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under 	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	awn from consideration.	·
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	cepted or b) objected to by e drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documen 2. Certified copies of the priority documen 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Appl prity documents have been rec au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ication No ceived in this National Stage
Attachment(s)	•	
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	_	mary (PTO-413) ail Date mal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Art Unit: 2174

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's Amendment filed 03/08/04 has been entered and carefully considered. Claims 1-15 have been amend. However, limitations of amended claims have not been found to be patentable over prior arts of record and newly discovered prior art. Therefore, these claims are rejected under the new ground of rejection as set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krueger et al [US. 5,265,202] in view of Rybczynski [US. 6,348,953] and further in view of the screendump.

As to claims 1 and 7, Krueger et al. discloses creating a first window to receive dynamic video content (figure 1, window (18)) which at least partially overlaps a second window on a region of overlap of a display (figure 1, display screen (16), column 2, line 67 through column 3, line 7). Krueger et al. cites "display screen 16 is displaying a computer application concurrently with an interlaced video image within a window 18". (Display screen 16 is a window because of displaying a computer application) and Krueger also cites

Art Unit: 2174

"the source of the video image can be either a channelized source, such as broadcast or cable television" which suggests dynamic video content; and the second window to draw after the first window (column 4, lines 15-40). Although Krueger et al. teaches both first and second (figure 2, 16, 18) windows movable with respect to a display, the screendump clearly shows the feature (see the figures).

The difference between Krueger et al. and the claim are the setting the pixels of the first window to a chroma color and setting background pixels of the second window in the region of overlap to the chroma color. Rybczynski shows the setting the pixels of the first window to a chroma color and setting background pixels of the second window in the region of overlap to the chroma color (column 7, lines 50-67 and column 8, lines 25-38). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Krueger et al. and Rybczynski before them at the time the invention was made to modify the overlaying windows taught by Krueger et al. to include rendering video to areas of the region of overlap which have the chroma color of Rybczynski, with the motivation being to combine a foreground image and a background image to give a composite image with a natural optical appearance as taught by Rybczynski.

As to claims 2 and 8, Krueger et al. and the screendump also discloses configuring the first and second movable windows as children of a common parent window (figure 1).

Art Unit: 2174

As to claims 3, 6, 9, 12 and 14, Krueger et al. and the screendump teaches configuring the second movable window to receive user interface events (column 5, lines 15-26).

As to claims 4, 10 and 15, Krueger et al. and screendump also teaches setting the style of the second movable window to transparent (column 5, lines 15-26).

As to claims 5, 11 and 13, the claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 except for configuring the first and second windows to move correspondingly to one another and the drawing and the rendering step. While Krueger et al. shows the configuring the first and second windows (column 6, lines 30-50), Rybczynski teaches draw first with a chroma color and then draw with other colors representing window elements (column 8, lines 25-40) and rendering video only area of the region of overlap which have the chroma color (video screen is type of window) (column 2, lines 35-60).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15 (movable windows) have been considered but are most in view of the new ground of rejection.

Conclusion

Responses to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231. If applicant desires fax a response, (703) 746-7238), may be used for formal After Final communications, (703)

Art Unit: 2174

746-7239 for Official communications, or (703) 746-7240 for Non-Official or draft communications. NOTE, A Request for Continuation (Rule 60 or 62) cannot be faxed.

Please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" for information facsimile communications. For after final responses, please label "AFTER FINAL" or "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE" on the document.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mylinh Tran whose telephone number is (703) 308-1304. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8.00AM to 6.30PM

If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner 's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640,

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Art Unit: 2174

Page 6

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.

Mylinh Tran

Art Unit 2174

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100